and voting if a quorum was present.

19¹

MR. MELVIN: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether there was any discussion on it because I was out of the room but it seems to me that on substantive matters it should be a majority of the members elected, on something as important as the constitution. I don't know whether it is possible to so back and reconsider it or not or whether any of the other members feel the same way. If they don't, that would be the end of it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Scafflan, do you want to comment?

MR. SCANLAN: We felt a majority of those present and voting was sufficient protection. If you went the other way, some important issues might not get considered or not considered expeditiously. There would be the possibility of a filibuster. We would think that most of the delegates would have enough interest in their work to be there and with an important vote coming up they would be there. We found no reason to limit a group representing the people with somewhat artificial parliamentarian restrictions about the vote required to